BALANCING OPERATIONS SECURITY AND OPENNESS:

Understanding the Military/Media Relationship in the Modern Media Environment

A Monograph

by

MAJ Jesse T. Sessoms II

United States Army

School of Advanced Military Studies

United States Army Command and General Staff College

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

AY 09-10

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED (From - To)
07-05-2010	SAMS Monograph	July 2009 – May 2010

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
BALANCING OPERATIONS SECURITY AND OPENNESS: Understanding the Military/Media Relationship in the Modern Media Environment	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
Major Jesse T. Sessoms II (U.S. Army)	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER
School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS) 250 Gibbon Avenue Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2134	

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
Foreign Military Studies Office & Command and General Staff College Director, FMSO 731 McClellan Ave. Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1350	FMSO / CGSC
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The media and the military play a role in the preservation of American freedoms. However, the military depends on operations security for many of its functions while the media demands wide-open publicity. Professionals in both fields must understand the diverse considerations between military operations security requirements and media obligations to keep the public informed and then seek to reconcile them. This monograph analyzes the military/media relationship in today's complex, hybrid military conflicts and the challenges of a complex and ever-changing modern media environment. This analysis demonstrates that both a free press and military operations security are established and advanced by the United States Constitution and all three branches of the Government. The free flow of information to the public is dependent upon a sound balance between openness and security. When that balance is compromised, the free flow of information is disrupted, often to the detriment of military and media trust and legitimacy in the eyes of the public. The monopoly over information and access to communications infrastructure once maintained by the government and commercial media outlets has been permanently broken. Globalization and the proliferation of the internet and other communications technologies provide ever-increasing access to information from countless media outlets as well as public citizens around the world. Enemies of the United States have learned to maximize this access to further their causes and ideologies. The American military and the media must proactively maintain the technical expertise and technological ability to compete with and overcome such enemy efforts in the information domain. Both organizations must understand potential solutions to problems created by tensions between the military and the media, as well as by the ever-changing modern media environment. Personal relationships between individuals from each field can foster trust and legitimacy that can be depended on in times of military conflict to maintain the flow of timely and accurate information to the public. Professionalism and standards already established by creeds and values statements in both organizations can provide mutually-agreeable rules and standards for the conduct of media operations during wartime. Tensions between both organizations are natural given their diverse obligations to the American public, but balance is achievable through understanding and cooperation.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Military-Media Relations, Operations Security, Globalization, Information Environment, Hybrid War, Communications Technology, Media Ethics, Army Values, Transparency

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: (U)			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Stefan J. Banach COL, U.S. Army
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)
(U)	(U)	(U)	(U)	80	913-758-3302

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

MAJ Jesse T. Sessoms II

Title of Monograph: BALANCING OPERATIONS SECURITY AND OPENNESS: Understanding the Military/Media Relationship in the Modern Media Environment

Approved by:

_____   Monograph Director
Andrew M. Johnson, LTC, SF

_____   Second Reader
Stephen A. Bourque, Ph.D.

_____   Third Reader
Drew Meyerowich, COL, IN

_____   Director,
Stefan Banach, COL, IN   School of Advanced
                                                                 Military Studies

_____   Director,
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.   Graduate Degree
                                                                 Programs

Abstract

BALANCING OPERATIONS SECURITY AND OPENNESS: Understanding the Military/Media Relationship in the Modern Media Environment by MAJ Jesse T. Sessoms II, U.S. Army, 46 pages.

The military/media relationship is historically tenuous. While both the media and the military play a role in the preservation of American freedoms, the military depends on operations security for many of its functions while the media demands wide-open publicity. Professionals in both fields must understand the diverse considerations between military operations security requirements and media obligations to keep the public informed and then seek to reconcile them. With this foundation in mind, three areas of understanding are important to examine. First military and media professionals must understand why both operations security and openness are essential to the maintenance of a strong national defense and a free press. Second, they must understand the challenges posed by the modern media environment. And finally, they must understand the common ground upon which a military/media relationship can be built.

This monograph analyzes the military/media relationship in today's complex, hybrid military conflicts. It provides a better understanding of the natural tensions between the military and the media and how operations security and openness can be balanced, given the challenges of a complex and ever-changing modern media environment. This analysis demonstrates that both a free press and military operations security are established and advanced by the United States Constitution and all three branches of the Government. The free flow of information to the public is dependent upon a sound balance between openness and security. When that balance is compromised, the free flow of information is disrupted, often to the detriment of military and media trust and legitimacy in the eyes of the public. This is demonstrated in cases such as the death of former NFL football star and Army Ranger, Pat Tillman, and the reporting by *Newsweek* of alleged desecration of the Koran by U.S. personnel at the Gitmo Detention Facility in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Analysis of literature, such as *War 2.0,* by Thomas Rid and Marc Hecker, demonstrates that the monopoly over information and access to communications infrastructure once maintained by the government (including the military) and commercial media outlets has been permanently broken. Globalization and the proliferation of the internet and other communications technologies provide ever-increasing access to information from countless media outlets as well as public citizens around the world. Enemies of the United States have learned to maximize this access to further their causes and ideologies. The American military and the media must proactively maintain the technical expertise and technological ability to compete with and overcome such enemy efforts in the information domain.

Both organizations must understand potential solutions to problems created by tensions between the military and the media, as well as by the ever-changing modern media environment. Military and media professionals, such as Lieutenant General (Retired) William G. Boykin and John Burns of the *New York Times*, attest to the fact that interaction between military and media professionals can be challenging. Personal relationships between individuals from each field can foster trust and legitimacy that can be depended on in times of military conflict to maintain the flow of timely and accurate information to the public. Professionalism and standards already established by creeds and values statements in both organizations can provide mutually-agreeable rules and standards for the conduct of media operations during wartime. Tensions between both organizations are natural given their diverse obligations to the American public, but balance is achievable through understanding and cooperation.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> Although a perfect cooperative union of the media and the military is likely impossible, given the differences in the missions and personalities, there are wise men and women in both institutions who recognize that their ultimate goal – the preservation of American freedoms – is the same.
> – Vice Admiral (Ret.) William P. Lawrence and Journalist Frank Aukofer [1]

Balance is a concept common to many Americans in many aspects of their lives. The term "balanced" is often used to describe things that are good, peaceful, fair, or perhaps things that are functioning properly. Americans balance work and leisure. They balance their budgets. They balance their diets. The United States Justice System is symbolized by blind Lady Justice upholding a balance scale. Americans learn about balance from childhood. What child has not spent time on a playground seesaw? It is just a simple board balanced on a pivot with seats and handles on either end. Children play the game of using their legs and body weight to raise and lower each other into the air. It does not take long for a child to learn that it works much better if the riders on either end of the toy are close to the same weight. When this is the case, the children can remain nearly effortlessly in motion, enjoying the up and down sensation of the ride. But when one child outweighs the other the lighter child is going to spend quite a bit of time suspended in the air by the heavier child who remains hopelessly pinned to the ground. From this example balance is a simple concept, but in some areas it can be difficult to achieve and maintain. One such area is the balance between military operations security (OPSEC) [2] and openness with the media and the public.

---

[1] Frank Aukofer and William P. Lawrence, *America's Team: The Odd Couple – A Report on the Relationship Between the Media and the Military* (Nashville, TN: Freedom Forum First Amendment Center at Vanderbilt University, 1995), viii.

[2] Operations security, or OPSEC, is formally defined: "In concise terms, the OPSEC process identifies the critical information of military plans, operations, and supporting activities and the indicators that can reveal it, and then develops measures to eliminate, reduce, or conceal those indicators." U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 530-1: *Operations Security*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008), 1.

Using the example of a playground seesaw, where the board represents the free flow of information, consider that one end is occupied by the military and operations security requirements while the other end represents the media and openness. Balance is found when the free-flow of information between the two entities remains in motion, propelled by an equal weight of emphasis and effort on the part of the military and the media. Both must work together to achieve this balance as both military operations security and media openness are necessary for the preservation of American freedoms. When too much weight is given to either end of the seesaw the free flow of information suffers. Too much weight on the operations security end and the military gets pinned to the ground while the media is suspended, forced to seek weight from sources other than the military to try and find balance. Too much weight on the openness end reverses the equation. The media becomes pinned to the ground and the military is suspended, unable to accomplish its mission.

The balance is also influenced by the will of the American people, represented by the pivot point, or the fulcrum upon which the free flow of information is balanced. Both the military and the media depend on the American public for trust and legitimacy. If the fulcrum moves closer to one end of the balance, it requires more effort on the other end to remain in motion and maintain the free-flow of information. Dwight Eisenhower said, "The first essential in military operations is that no information of value shall be given to the enemy. The first essential in newspaper work and broadcasting is wide-open publicity. It is your job and mine to try to reconcile those sometimes diverse considerations." [3]

Many military service members take pride in being referred to as "quiet professionals" who often depend on surprise and security for their operations. Members of the press, however,

---

are anything but silent as they compete to keep the public informed with as many details as possible about U.S. military operations. The media and the military have very different views of what the balance between operations security and openness should look like. While the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides for a free press,[4] tight security in military operations is critical to mission accomplishment and minimizing American and coalition casualties. Tensions between the two professions are a natural occurrence given their respective obligations to the American public, but these tensions are often exaggerated by experiences and perceptions perpetuated through the years from previous wars and conflicts. Bernard Trainor, a retired Marine Corps General turned *New York Times* correspondent, expressed the view that, "Today's officer corps carries as part of its cultural baggage a loathing for the press." He goes on to describe that, "The credo of the military seems to have become 'duty, honor, country, and hate the media.'"[5]

These tensions are also compounded by the fact that technological advances continually increase competition for news and information in a modern American society dominated by the internet and twenty-four-hour a day access to news from local, national and international media outlets. The "new media" of internet blogs and social networking sites has also destroyed the information monopoly once held by the media and the government and given a voice to anyone with internet access and a will to have their opinions and perspectives heard. Additionally, the lines between domestic and foreign audiences are increasingly blurred by globalization. Maintaining the balance between operations security and openness with the public and the media requires more diligence than ever before, and it is increasingly evident that neither the military nor the media can accomplish their objectives during wartime without one another. The

---

[4] U.S. Constitution, Art. 1.

[5] Thomas Rid and Marc Hecker, *War 2.0, Irregular Warfare in the Information Age* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger Security International, 2009), 62.

messages and images that reach worldwide in real-time through countless traditional and new media outlets maintain the potential to influence public opinion and military operations more so than during any other time in history. These messages and images must be treated accordingly by both the military and the media. When either side ignores this fact, history shows that they do so at their own peril.

Given the competing aspects and unprecedented access to information observed in the modern media environment, how can media and military professionals achieve and maintain balance between operations security and openness? Quite simply, they must understand the "diverse considerations"[6] between military operations security requirements and media obligations to keep the public informed and then seek to reconcile them. Army Field Manual 3.0, *Operations* (FM 3.0), states that, "relevant information fuels understanding and fosters initiative," and that "greater understanding enables commanders to make better decisions."[7] These ideas apply to the military and media professional alike. With this foundation in mind, three areas of understanding are important to examine. First, military and media professionals must understand why both operations security and openness are essential to the maintenance of a strong national defense and a free press. Second, they must understand the challenges posed by the modern media environment. And finally, they must understand the common ground upon which a military/media relationship can be built. Understanding is the most critical step towards reconciling the diverse considerations between the media and the military.

---

[6] Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1944, quoted in Paul and Kim, *Reporters on the Battlefield*, 1.

[7] U.S. Department of the Army, Field Manual 3.0: *Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008), 5-4.

Understanding Why Balance is Necessary

> We cannot overstate the importance of the media in developing the stories, the mind-sets, and the perceptions of those in our own country—policy makers and the general public—as well as those in our adversaries' countries. Moreover, journalists are rarely the objective reporters that they would like people to believe; rather than being simply the providers of information about events, they have increasingly become part of the events.
> - Christine A. R. MacNulty, FRSA, President & CEO, Applied Futures, Inc.[8]

Operations security and openness are both essential to the maintenance of a strong military and a legitimate free press. Understanding the reasons why this is so provides a great foundation for achieving and maintaining balance in the military/media relationship. This relationship is sometimes tenuous, due in part to the fact that the very nature of military and media activities and obligations lead to differing views of what the balance between operations security and openness should look like. The Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics includes the tenet, "Act Independently – Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know."[9] The Army's definition of operations security introduced in the previous section and reiterated here is, "In concise terms, the OPSEC process identifies the critical information of military plans, operations, and supporting activities and the indicators that can reveal it, and then develops measures to eliminate, reduce, or conceal those indicators."[10] While both professions are responsible for protecting American liberties, the methods and requirements by which they do so are often diametrically opposed.

The tensions between these two ideals are deeply rooted in American history. The United States Government was built on the principle of checks and balances and the military/media relationship is an extension of that concept. Examining the roots of the free press

---

[8] Christine A.R. MacNulty, "Truth, Perception, and Consequences" (Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Proteus Management Group, 2009), 17.

[9] Society of Professional Journalists, "Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics," http://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf (accessed February 10, 2010).

[10] U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 530-1: *Operations Security*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008), 1.

and military security requirements demonstrates that both carry enough weight to justify balance between the two. Neither side has the leeway to tell the other that their requirements and obligations are unfounded or unimportant, though history proves that both sides have done just that. Understanding these tensions and the mistakes of the past is a big step towards balancing the equation in the future.

The roots of the free press are easy to define, as they were established in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; **or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press**; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."[11] Freedom of the press is a household term in American society. The First Amendment is arguably the most quoted and well known of any of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States. One of the traditional roles of the free press is to keep the American public informed of the activities of the U.S. Government, of which the military is a part. This role is so critical to democracy that that the press has historically been referred to as the "4th Estate" of the government, behind the legislative, judicial, and executive branches. Thomas Jefferson wrote that, "Our liberty cannot be guarded but by the freedom of the press, nor that be limited without danger of losing it."[12] John Adams held similar views explaining that, "Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right…and a desire to know; but besides this, they have a right, an

---

[11] U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, emphasis added.

[12] Thomas Jefferson letter to John Jay in 1786, quoted in Eyler Robert Coates, Sr., "Thomas Jefferson on Politics and Government," The University of Virginia, http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff1600.htm (accessed March 25, 2010).

indisputable right, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the characters and conduct of their rulers."[13]

The directive nature of the First Amendment is clear and concise, and without further analysis, one might conclude that there is no comparable weight on the military's end of the balance when it comes to operations security. However, upon deeper examination, that is simply not the case. Understanding the military's security requirements involves an analysis of U.S. military doctrine, the U.S. Constitution and documents and official statements from all three branches of the U.S. Government. Just as with the establishment of the free press, the U.S. Constitution is a great place to look for the roots of military operations security requirements. The preamble to the U.S. Constitution explains that the Constitution is ordained and established to "provide for the common defense."[14] If the government, through the military, is to provide for the common defense, provisions must be made to protect information that could endanger the United States and its citizens. This premise establishes a firm foundation for the military's doctrine pertaining to operations security.

The Army's FM 3.0 includes Surprise and Security as two of the nine Principles of War and explains that these two principles are interdependent, as Security is essential to Surprise. FM 3.0 further defines Surprise as, "Strike the enemy at a time or place or in a manner for which he is unprepared." Security is defined as, "Never permit the enemy to acquire and unexpected advantage."[15] Considering that these are two of the nine principles that make up the very fabric of military operations, their importance cannot be overstated. Surprise and Security are impossible without the military's ability to maintain tight security in relation to sensitive

---

[13] John Adams, quoted in Anthony Lewis, *Freedom for the Thought That We Hate: A Biography of the First Amendment* (New York: Basic Books, Perseus Books Group, 2007), 18.

[14] U.S. Constitution, Preamble.

[15] U.S. Department of the Army, FM 3.0*,* A-3.

operational and intelligence information. If the military was required to relinquish this privilege in today's globally connected media environment every future enemy of the United States would have complete knowledge of where, when, and how U.S. Military forces were going to operate.

The Supreme Court supports this idea stating that the U.S. Government can, "regulate the content of constitutionally protected speech in order to promote a compelling interest if it chooses the least restrictive means to further the articulated interest."[16] If the United States is to continue to exist as a sovereign nation with all the freedoms and liberties enjoyed by its citizens, there may very well be no other interest more compelling than the promotion of a common defense. This is also evident in that very few cases involving members of the media suing the military over security restrictions have ever seen the inside of a courtroom, and those that do tend to result in favorable outcomes for the military.

One such case was levied by Larry Flynt, the publisher of *Hustler* magazine, over the military's media blackout during the first two days of the Grenada invasion in October 1983. Flynt argued that this blackout was unconstitutional. The case took some time to process through the legal system. When the district court sided with the government on June 21, 1984, the ban that only applied during the first forty eight hours of the conflict had been lifted for several months. The judge dismissed the case on the basis that there was no longer a live controversy and that the plaintiff lacked a "legally cognizable interest in the outcome."[17] The Court of Appeals upheld the district court ruling. The case was never judged based on its merits, but the district court judge, Oliver Gasch, said that he doubted whether the temporary ban on press

---

[16] U.S. Supreme Court, "Sable Communications of California v. Federal Communications Commission, 492 U.S. 115, 126 (1989)," Justia, U.S. Supreme Court Center, http://supreme.justia.com /us / 492/115/case.html (accessed February 10, 2010).

[17] Aukofer and Lawrence, *America's Team, 47*-48.

coverage had violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights and said that he believed that, "the exclusion of the press to maintain secrecy was within the discretion of the military."[18]

The United States Congress has addressed the protection of sensitive and classified defense information in the form of statutory laws that deem criminal the disclosure of various types of defense information. Title 18, Section 1of the U.S. Code, entitled, "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," establishes these protections in Chapter 37, "Espionage and Censorship."[19] Chapter 37 makes criminal such activities as gathering, transmitting, or losing defense information, photographing sensitive military facilities and installations, and provides stiff penalties in the form of prison sentences and monetary fines that vary in length and amount based on the severity of the crime.

The executive branch also throws its weight behind military security requirements. National Security Information has been protected through the years by a series of Presidential Executive Orders.[20] These orders provide for the classifying, safeguarding, and de-classification of National Security Information. The most recent Presidential Executive Order signed by President George W. Bush very clearly states the requirement for military restrictions on public and media access:

> Our democratic principles require that the American people be informed of the activities of their Government. Also, our Nation's progress depends on the free flow of information. Nevertheless, throughout our history, the national defense has required that certain information be maintained in confidence in order to protect our citizens, our

---

[18] Aukofer and Lawrence, *America's Team,* 47-48.

[19] Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives, "United States Code" GPO.gov, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/usc.cgi?ACTION=BROWSE&TITLE= 18USCPI&PDFS=YES (accessed September 26, 2009).

[20] Most recently Presidential Executive Order (PEO) No. 12958, signed by President Bill Clinton on April 17, 1995 and further amended by PEO No. 13292, signed by President George W. Bush on March 28, 2003, The National Archives, http://www.archives.gov/isoo/policy-documents/eo-12958-amendment.pdf (accessed March 31, 2010).

democratic institutions, our homeland security, and our interactions with foreign nations. Protecting information critical to our Nation's security remains a priority.[21]

Maintaining national security is clearly a major priority for all three branches of the Government. Military operations security is deserving of its weight on the balance opposite the media's obligations for openness. Identifying the importance of these two players is critical, but a balance between them is difficult to achieve.

The will of the American people is critical to maintaining a proper balance between operations security and openness, acting as a fulcrum upon with the free flow of information must be balanced. When military or media professionals try to tip the balance in favor of illegitimate or self-serving interests, the fulcrum that is American public opinion can shift in favor of one side or the other and compromise the free flow of information. A 2009 Gallup poll assessing American confidence levels in various organizations showed that eighty two percent of Americans have high confidence in the military, rating the military in first place above all other ranked organizations. The military has maintained a rating of first or second place above all other organizations since the beginning of this tracking in 1973. As for the media, the most current poll reflects a confidence level of only twenty three percent in television news and twenty five percent in newspapers.[22] Being at the short end of the balance makes the media's ability to gain and maintain the trust of the American people more difficult. That which is morally acceptable to the American public, however, is a moving target. Military and media practices accepted by American society vary from conflict to conflict and generation to generation.

Morality in American society tends to be greatly influenced by politics. The debate over sensitive interrogation techniques during the summer and fall of 2009 provides a timely example

---

[21] Executive Order No. 13292," The National Archives, http://www.archives.gov/isoo/policy-documents/eo-12958-amendment.pdf (accessed February 10, 2010).

[22] Lydia Saad, "Americans' Confidence in Military Up, Banks Down," Gallup, http://www.gallup.com/poll /121214/Americans-Confidence-Military-Banks-Down.aspx (accessed September 14, 2009).

of this influence. Through political and media discourse during the changeover from the Bush Administration to the Obama Administration in late 2008 and early 2009, "water-boarding" became a household term and is now synonymous with torture. It is difficult to judge how morally objectionable the practice of water-boarding or the decision of government entities not to disclose such practices might have been to American society in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. However, with changes and shifts of power in the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches of the Government, there is always the potential for a change in the views of what is morally acceptable in American society.

On 1 October 2009, the Obama Administration implemented new rules regarding the protection of state secrets. The new rules require government agencies to prove to the U.S. Attorney General that the release of certain information would threaten national security. Attorney General Eric Holder said that the requirements would "provide greater accountability and ensure that the state secrets privilege is invoked only when necessary and in the narrowest way possible."[23] This initiative took place after several months of very public government and media discussion regarding the disclosure of classified interrogation techniques used on terrorism suspects and the identities of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) agents and military personnel who employed the techniques during the Bush Administration. The initiative exemplifies the ever-so-delicate balance of security and openness concerning military and government affairs.

As of March 2009, PEO's 12958 and 13292, referred to in the previous section, are under review by the Obama Administration. In a Memorandum to the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies on the subject of Classified Information and the Control of Unclassified Information, the Obama Administration expressed their intent to operate with "an unprecedented

---

[23] Ari Shapiro, "Obama Toughens State Secrets Privilege," NPR, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=113135772&ft=1&f=1001 (accessed September 24, 2009).

level of openness." In the same memorandum, President Obama acknowledged the continued

need to protect sensitive and classified national security information, but added that,

"a democratic government accountable to the people must be as transparent as possible and must

not withhold information for self-serving reasons or simply to avoid embarrassment." [24] This

idea of avoiding "over-classification" for self-serving reasons or avoiding embarrassment is

critical to maintaining the morality of military operations security restrictions. Abuse of these

restrictions to save face and avoid embarrassment has historically cost the military dearly, not

only in public confidence, but also in time and resources. A recent example of this can be found

in the U.S. Army Special Operation Command's (USASOC) handling of the friendly-fire death of

former NFL football star and Army Ranger, Pat Tillman.

Initial reports of Tillman's death in Afghanistan on April 22, 2004 claimed that he was

killed by hostile fire during an ambush on his patrol.[25] Tillman was posthumously awarded the

Silver Star and the Purple Heart only eight days after the incident based on reports of his valorous

and heroic actions during the firefight, even though there was much speculation in military

channels that he was actually a victim of fratricide. It was finally determined that there was no

enemy fire involved in the incident and that two friendly patrols had mistakenly fired upon each

other during an enemy ambush. This information was withheld from the family and an official

memorial service in Tillman's honor recognized his heroic actions in the face of hostile fire.[26]

The ensuing congressional investigation indicted individuals all the way to the top of the

USASOC chain-of-command, culminating with a reprimand of USASOC's Commanding

---

[24] Barrack H. Obama, "Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, SUBJECT:Classified Information and Controlled Unclassified Information," Whitehouse.gov, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Presidential-Memorandum-Classified-Information-and-Controlled-Unclassified-Information/ (accessed September 24, 2009).

[25] United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Report: *Misleading Information from the Battlefield: The Tillman and Lynch Episodes* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2008), 11.

[26] Steve Coll, "Army Spun Tale Around Ill-Fated Mission," *Washington Post* (December 6, 2004).

General, Lieutenant General Philip Kensinger. The investigation focused not only on the circumstances of Pat Tillman's death, but more so on the handling of subsequent information by the command and other political figures.[27] Information was withheld from the media, the public, and most importantly, Pat Tillman's family without a firm basis of security concerns. Reports of Pat Tillman's death, while significant, were a mere ripple in daily media coverage of the war in Afghanistan until the cover-up caused a media tsunami.

Similar circumstances surrounded reporting on the capture and subsequent rescue of Private First Class Jessica Lynch during the opening days of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM. Lynch was captured after her logistics convoy was attacked by Iraqi forces on March 23, 2003. Her captors moved her to an Iraqi hospital in the town of An Nasiriyah for the succeeding seven days and treated her wounds. She was rescued by a U.S. special operations unit on April 1, 2003.[28]

In the days following her rescue, reports filtered into the media that she fought valiantly, firing and emptying her M-16 rifle at the enemy as the convoy was being attacked and her friends were dying around her. Reports also indicated that the rescue force came under fire outside of the hospital during the rescue operation. Both reports were later proven inaccurate. Lynch testified that she had taken no such heroic actions during the ambush. Investigations and interviews also indicated that the rescue was uncontested and that the special operations unit did not come under hostile fire during the mission. Congressional investigators attributed the proliferation of

---

[27] United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Misleading Information*, 20-37.

[28] United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Misleading Information*, 41-47.

inaccurate information to the Bush Administration and the United States Military seeking to make operations in Iraq seem more positive than they actually were.[29]

These cases clearly demonstrate moral failures on the part of military and political leadership. The Tillman and Lynch cases, when considered along with such infamous stories as the Abu Ghraib detainee abuse scandal, echo potential systemic issues throughout the Army. But considering that current public confidence in the media is below that of the military, journalists and media professionals also have their work cut out for them in fostering a healthy balance of openness and operations security. Public distrust of the media arguably stemming from the reporting of inaccuracies and biases often moves the fulcrum of American public opinion in favor of the military. The majority of Americans (59%) believe that the military, rather than news organizations, should exert more control over news on the war in Afghanistan. That is about the same proportion that supported military censorship in the Persian Gulf War (57%) in 1991.[30] Such opinions hinder military/media engagement and make the press's job of informing the public more difficult.

Where the Tillman and Lynch incidents are reason to pause for consideration on the part of the military, the reporting by *Newsweek* magazine referencing allegations of a Koran being flushed down a toilet by U.S. personnel at the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility in June 2005 should bring pause to journalists. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General (Ret.) Richard B. Myers said that the military's investigation of the incident required sorting and review of over 1.6 million documents and countless man hours to find that no such incident ever took place. Pentagon Spokesman Lawrence DiRita reported that during the review of thousands and

[29] United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Misleading Information*, 41-47.

[30] The Pew Charitable Trusts, "No Rise in Fears or Reported Depression; Public Remains Steady in Face of Anthrax Scare," *Public Opinion and Polls,* Washington, D.C.: The Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, October 15, 2001, http://www.pewtrusts.com/ideas /ideas_item.cfm?content_item_id=785&content_type_id=18 (as of June 17, 2004), quoted in Paul and Kim, *Reporters on the Battlefield*, 32.

thousands of interrogation reports and interactions with detainees, U.S. Southern Command "found 5 incidents of apparent mishandling by guards or interrogators and 15 incidents of mishandling and outright desecration of the Koran by the detainees." [31]

Newsweek is by no means an anomaly in reporting inaccurate and unfounded information about the military. Similar circumstances surround the joint reporting of Craig Pyes of the "Crimes of War Project" and Kevin Sack of the *Los Angeles Times* on a Special Forces Operational Detachment Alpha (ODA) operating out of Gardez, Afghanistan in 2003. Pyes and Sack reported on two separate alleged murders of Afghan citizens detained by members of ODA 2021. During the first incident, ODA 2021 conducted a cordon and search operation in an Afghan village after they were ambushed nearby. During the search, several military aged Afghan men were taken into custody under suspicion that they were involved in the ambush. One of the detainees was shot and killed during a struggle with a member of the ODA.

Pyes and Sack interviewed eyewitnesses of the incident, including one Afghan man who claimed to be the brother of the victim. He claimed that the victim came out of one of the huts in the village begging not to be shot and one of the American soldiers raised his weapon and shot him in cold blood. [32] This is the account that the *Los Angeles Times* published without any further investigation on the part of the journalists. The Army conducted a thorough criminal investigation based on the journalists' reports. Questioning of the team members and supporting forensic evidence told a very different story than that published in the *Los Angeles Times*. The Afghan man shot by the ODA team member was in excess of six feet tall (much larger than average Afghan males), while the ODA team member was much smaller. When the team

---

[31] Cliff Kincaid, "The Media vs. The Military," Accuracy in Media, AIM.org, http://www.aim.org/media-monitor/print/the-media-vs-the-military/ (accessed September 26, 2009).

[32] Craig Pyes and Kevin Sack, "In Cowboy and Indian Country: A Special Forces Unit in Afghanistan - PART TWO," Crimes of War Project, http://www.crimesofwar.org/onnews/news-gardez2.html (accessed February 10, 2010).

member tried to place flex-cuffs on the man to take him into custody, the Afghan grabbed the barrel of the soldier's M-4 rifle and attempted to wrestle it away. A second team member stepped in to assist, but when both soldiers were unable to subdue the Afghan, the first team member pulled the trigger on his weapon, shooting the Afghan in the chest and killing him. Forensic investigation revealed powder-burns on the sleeves of the Afghan man's tunic, confirming the ODA team member's testimony.[33]

The second incident reported by Pyes and Sack in the very same *Los Angeles Times* article involved a group of Afghan detainees that became known as "the Gardez Seven."[34] The incident involved Afghan Army recruits detained for conducting illegal checkpoints in support of a local warlord. ODA 2021 took the detainees to their fire base in Gardez where they were subsequently given instructions to turn the detainees over to local Afghan Police authorities for processing. One of the detainees was reported by ODA 2021 team members to be very ill when he was taken into custody. He was treated by the team's medical support personnel at the firebase, but died of his illness before the transfer to the Afghan Police took place. ODA 2021's team leader delivered the six surviving detainees and the body of the seventh to Afghan officials so that the body could be buried appropriately according to Muslim Law.

Upon their turnover to Afghan officials, the six surviving detainees reported that they were severely beaten and tortured during interrogations by U.S. Forces and that the seventh detainee died of injuries received during the torture. Journalists Pyes and Sack caught wind of the incident and began collecting interviews from the detainees and Afghan officials that, without further investigation, appeared in their *Los Angeles Times* story about ODA 2021 and their alleged abuses and misconduct. Army criminal investigators once again conducted a thorough

---

[33] COL Leonard Kiser, former 20th SFG(A) Commander, telephonically interviewed by author, September 28, 2009.

[34] Pyes and Sack, "In Cowboy and Indian Country."

investigation, and while the family would not make the body of the dead detainee available for examination, investigators examined the survivors and found no signs of physical abuse or torture. The ODA 2021 team leader was given a General Officer Letter of Reprimand for failing to properly report the detainee death up through the chain of command before the transfer to Afghan authorities took place, but no further infractions or crimes could be substantiated.[35]

American society should expect military and journalism professionals alike to uphold the highest standards of honesty and forthrightness, especially in cases where either has made a mistake or reported inaccurate information. There is no moral argument for releasing potentially inaccurate information or withholding information from the media and the press without defendable security concerns, as occurred in reports about Pat Tillman and Jessica Lynch. In turn, *Newsweek's* unsubstantiated reporting of Koran abuse at Guantanamo Bay and the *Los Angeles Times* unsubstantiated reporting on ODA 2021 is inexcusable. These cases demonstrate that both the military and the media have moral obligations in maintaining an acceptable balance of operations security and openness. Military professionals in one case and journalists in the others endangered the fragile trust of the American people, sliding the fulcrum and disrupting the flow of accurate information to the public.

So what is to be understood about why both openness and appropriate security measures are necessary for the maintenance of a strong military and a legitimate free press? The media's obligation to keep the American Public informed is clearly established in the Constitution of the United States. The provision of the common defense is also a constitutional mandate that falls upon the military. The common defense of the United States is difficult, if not impossible without maintaining operations security. Both military requirements for operations security and

---

[35] Kiser, interview.

the need for a free press are clearly recognized and upheld by all three branches of the United States Government and the citizens they represent.

Military professionals and journalists both carry the burden of ensuring that an acceptable balance between operations security and openness remains at the core of their interactions with one another in facilitating the free flow of information to the public. Military professionals must maintain the highest standards of integrity and forthrightness by avoiding withholding or providing inaccurate information for self-serving or other unnecessary reasons while journalists maintain the highest standards by honoring the need for security restrictions and reporting honestly on military issues, be they flattering or embarrassing. If these standards can be upheld, the First Amendment's freedom of the press will be promoted while the military remains strong and capable of providing for the common defense of the United States. The balance must remain under constant scrutiny by all parties concerned if it is to maintain pace with the ever-shifting tides of morality and an increasingly transparent global media environment.

Understanding the Challenges of the Modern Media Environment

> Military decision makers saw that improved flow of public information as a set of huge problems: journalists don't understand the business of war; they compromise operational security by unknowingly giving away secrets valuable to the enemy; and gruesome images of inadvertent mistakes and casualties undermine public resolve, making it even harder to fight and win wars. – *War 2.0*[36]

Understanding the roots of tensions between the military and the media is only one part of a balanced relationship. It is important that both the military and the media understand new challenges present in today's complex media environment and how they may influence the balance between openness and operations security today and in the future. We live in an age of unprecedented technological growth in the area of media and information sharing. Karl Fisch, a school teacher in Littleton, CO, put together a presentation entitled, "Shift Happens" that provides some insight into the recent growth of information technology. The presentation explains that the top ten jobs for the year 2010 did not exist in 2004, stating that, "We are currently preparing students for jobs that don't exist yet, using technologies that haven't been invented, in order to solve problems we don't even know are problems yet." The presentation further explains that a week's worth of *New York Times* newspapers contains more information than an average individual was exposed to in an entire lifetime in the 18th century. [37] Given the nearly incomprehensible and ever-increasing amount of information available on the internet, the challenges of the modern media environment are clear.

Advances in communications technology have created an insatiable appetite for news and information among both American and international consumers. The fulcrum that is the will of the American people can shift quickly and drastically and throw off the balance between the

---

[36] Rid and Hecker, *War 2.0,* 4.

[37] Karl Fisch, "Shift Happens," The Fischbowl, http://thefischbowl.blogspot.com/ (accessed March 19, 2010).

media and the military in this environment, a balance that is arguably more vulnerable than at any other time in history.

Modern information technologies provide unprecedented access to information. Americans have become accustomed to twenty-four/seven on-demand access to news and information through countless domestic and international news outlets and internet sites. This access drives demand, and demand drives more aggressive competition for stories than in times past. Not only does the public have unprecedented access to information, but also to the very communications infrastructure over which that information is transmitted. While the military and the press may still be two of the biggest players in the modern media environment, their information dominance has been compromised by the proliferation of small, cheap mobile communications devices that put the power of global communication into the hands of average citizens. Access to information and communications infrastructure has also created a world of global connectivity. Globalization has nearly erased the division between international and domestic audiences. All of these factors have the potential to compromise the balance between openness and operations security.

Researchers estimate that more new information has been transferred within the previous thirty years than in the past 5,000.[38] It is estimated that the average newspaper in 1900 had eight pages. By 2000, newspapers average sixty-five pages during the week and over 200 pages on the weekend.[39] The television industry shows similar trends. Citizens in the age of television prior to the late 1970's received most of their entertainment and news information from the "Big Three" networks of ABC, NBC, and CBS, as well as in their local daily newspaper. Events deemed important enough to be communicated outside of the normal evening news broadcast

---

[38] Susan Hubbard, quoted in Adam Thierer and Grant Eskelsen, *Media Metrics: The True State of the Modern Media Marketplace* (Washington, D.C., The Progress & Freedom Foundation, 2008), 17.

[39] Benjamin Compaine, quoted in Thierer and Eskelsen, *Media Metrics,* 17.

were typically delivered on the heels of the statement, "We interrupt this scheduled program to bring you the following special news bulletin." If the President wanted to speak to the American people, he easily monopolized the airwaves. Those days are long gone. The evolution of television from the "Big Three" of yesteryear to the overwhelming selection of channels available through broadcast, cable, and satellite television today is remarkable. Cable overtook VHF/UHF broadcasts in the 1970's and 80's, satellite television arrived in the 1990's, and on-demand telco-delivered video marks the current era. An estimated eighty-six percent of Americans subscribe to multichannel video distribution services. Available channels on such services grew from seventy in 1990 to 565 in 2006. As a result the "Big Three" audience share has plummeted from ninety percent to thirty-two percent.[40]

A new generation of "digital natives" depends very little on television at all as a source of information. They rarely stay home to watch the news. Access to the internet has gone mobile through an ever-improving and affordable selection of compact computers and phones. They are a generation for whom surfing the internet for unlimited news and information is second-nature. Those from generations past who still prefer to get their information from newspapers and television news broadcasts are referred to as "digital immigrants" who find this environment much more foreign than the generations that follow them.[41] Digital natives of today's society will settle for nothing less than on-demand access to information from a countless selection of twenty-four/seven news networks and internet sites. Demand for information is only compounded by the speed at which videos, photos and information are transmitted globally via various means, such as satellites and fiber optic cable networks. Thomas Rid and Marc Hecker, in their book, *War 2.0*, summarize the consequences of this shortened timeframe explaining that, "Modern democracies have a shortened attention span; driven by the new media, news cycles

---

[40] Thierer and Eskelsen, *Media Metrics*.

[41] Rid and Hecker, *War 2.0,* 9.

have accelerated, markets swiftly react to political crises, and voter preferences may be more volatile."[42]

Competition for stories in this environment is fierce. It takes quite a bit of content to fill a twenty-four/seven news cycle, so media outlets tend to grasp at every potential piece of information that floats through the airwaves. Media outlets often rush to be the first to break a story without taking the opportunity to properly vet sources and information. Furthermore, when stories are proven to be inaccurate, as was the case in the previously mentioned *Newsweek* story about Korans being flushed down a toilet at the Guantanamo detention facility, news outlets give very little prominence to retractions. Such retractions are usually so late after the fact that most audiences have moved on and forgotten about the original story from which any damage to military interests has already taken its toll on public opinion and support.

It is critical that military and media professionals understand how this unprecedented access to information can produce much more volatile swings in public opinion, making a balance between openness and operations security much more difficult to achieve. It requires patience and integrity on the part of media and military professionals to limit the amount of sensitive or inaccurate information released to the public. It also requires a timely and accurate response when such efforts fail.

Not only do individuals today have unprecedented access to information, but also to the very technology over which it is passed. Over the past 200 years only two organizations, governmental organizations (including the armed forces) and professional media organizations, leveraged the capability to monopolize and effectively employ communications technology in wartime.[43] The rise of the internet and small, affordable mobile communications devices has changed all of that. Just about anyone can employ the power of modern communications

---

[42] Rid and Hecker, *War 2.0,* 49.

[43] Rid and Hecker, *War 2.0,* 35.

technology to communicate nearly instantaneously all around the globe. They are no longer just

spectators on the sidelines watching the news on television. Now they can participate in the news

cycle through any number of media, such as internet social media and blogging websites. Clay

Shirky, in his book, *Here Comes Everybody*, explains it this way:

> We are living in the middle of the largest increase in expressive capability in the history
> of the human race. More people can communicate more things to more people than has
> ever been possible in the past, and the size and speed of this increase, from under one
> million participants to over one billion in a generation, makes the change unprecedented,
> even considered against the background of previous revolutions in communications
> tools.[44]

One way to describe the modern media environment is to say that anyone can be a

"journalist." Some professional journalists disagree with this point, but the fact is that in addition

to the press corps, modern technology allows civilians and soldiers on the battlefield to

instantaneously post information on internet blogs, news sites, and social networking sites. The

modern definition of "journalist" must be considered a question of status or function. The term

"journalist" is no longer limited to a definition of status or title (ie. someone employed by a news

organization) but, in the modern media environment, includes the definition of function, by which

anyone who performs the function of "gathering, preparing, collecting, photographing, recording,

writing, editing, reporting, or publishing of news or information that concerns local, national, or

international events or other matters of public interest for dissemination to the public"[45] may be

considered a journalist. Military professionals now have to remain cognizant that anyone on the

battlefield with access to a camera, a cell phone, or an internet connection can capture and

transmit images and data globally in a matter of seconds, creating an instantaneous breach of

security. Such information can immediately influence the constant reporting of the modern

---

[44] Clay Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations* (New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2008), 106.

[45] Sarah Evans, "Bloggers and Citizen Journalists," Mashable, The Social Media Guide, http://mashable.com/2009/12/18/media-shield-law/ (accessed March 22, 2010).

twenty-four/seven news cycle provided by countless domestic and international news outlets and, depending on the nature of the information, sway domestic and international public opinion.

The right story about the right event released at the right time can become a media frenzy, regardless of who reported it. As a case in point, since their 1979 Islamic Revolution, Iran has been recognized as an extremely closed society controlled by a dictatorial fundamentalist Islamic government. During the Iranian Presidential Elections of August 2009, Iranian citizens were reportedly communicating the civil unrest and discontentment over the illegitimacy of the elections to American and international media outlets through transmitted cell-phone images and "Twitter" postings on that internet social media site. The Iranian government was nearly powerless to control or censor the release of such disparaging information to the international community. The Iranian example also exemplifies the speed at which information is transmitted, compounded by a twenty-four/seven news cycle during which journalists and other entities compete to be the first to release a story, whether it has been substantiated or not. Such was the case with the "Twitter" reports from Iran. While there was no way for news outlets to prove that such reports were actually coming from Iranian citizens on the ground in Iran, these snippets were reported as fact without thorough investigation.

In light of this complex information playground where just about anyone can add weight to either side of the balance between operations security and openness, military professionals must remain increasingly diligent in protecting sensitive information. Military professionals must maintain the technological competence and capability to monitor and respond quickly to both accurate and inaccurate information that may pop up in the media. Media professionals must also remain tech-savvy and adaptive to keep up with the best ways to communicate information to the public. If they wish to remain "professional journalists," they must set themselves apart through professional development and education. They must gain and maintain trust and legitimacy in the eyes of the public through honest, thoroughly vetted reporting.

The issues discussed in this section are by no means an American anomaly. Globalization, broadly defined as the increasingly rapid exchange of capital, goods, and services, as well as information, technology, ideas, people, and culture,[46] has drastically changed the battlefields upon which the United States Military currently, and in the future, conducts operations. Colonel (Retired) John J. McCuen's thoughts on hybrid war give great insight into the complexity of modern battlefields: "Let me emphasize the critical point that to win hybrid wars, we must win on all three battlegrounds: the conventional battleground, the combat country population battleground, and the home front/international community population battleground."[47] It is important that military professionals consider information to be just as important as any other weapon system in their arsenal in a world where globalization is the rule. In this environment, people around the world have access to information from countless cultures, sub-cultures and societies. Non-western civilizations are able to peer into western societies and may perceived inequalities in standards of living and global economic success.

The technology that allows societies to observe such disparity also allows them to exploit and capitalize on such information for the furtherance of anti-western ideologies. Enemies are mastering the art of using the media as an asymmetric weapon of warfare to influence populations in combat zones as well as international and American public opinion. Australia's Army recognizes these issues in their most recent concept of land warfare which states, "Globalised media, satellite communications, international travel and commerce, and the Internet facilitate the coordination of diffuse ideas that oppose Western dominance. The free flow of capital, people

---

[46] National Intelligence Council, *Mapping the Global Future* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), 10.

[47] John J. McCuen, "The Art of Hybrid War," *Military Review*, (March-April 2008): 107-113.

and ideas allows the spread of ideologies inimical to globalisation, and provides the means for their further development."[48]

Any soldier that has participated in operations in Iraq and Afghanistan can no doubt attest to the sight of countless satellite dishes hanging from countless residences in urban areas, as well as in many rural areas. Cell phones are an even more common sight on the streets of these asymmetric battlefields. It is not an unusual occurrence to see CNN International on televisions in local businesses in Iraqi and Afghan communities. In much the same manner, it is not uncommon to see "Al Jazeera" being watched by students in between classes at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. The lines between U.S. domestic and international audiences are a dim gray at best.

Countless authors and analysts have written about the so called "CNN Effect" whereby combat operations, international diplomacy and policy have been influenced by constant real-time coverage of world events.[49] The CNN Effect was first discussed in reference to CNN's television coverage of Operations DESERT SHIELD and DESERT STORM in 1991, but the effect has only increased as more and more members of the global community gain access to numerous media outlets around the world through modern media and communications technology. The effects of global media connectivity have driven military decision makers on many occasions in recent history. A few of the more prominent examples are military operations in Somalia in 1992-1993, and more recently the coverage of the shooting of a Koran on a firing range by a U.S. soldier in Iraq in 2008. In addition to these examples, the ability of our enemies to leverage global connectivity to gain attention and support for their ideologies and causes must also be examined.

---

[48] Australian Army Headquarters, *Adaptive Campaigning 2009 – Army's Future Land Operating Concept*, (Canberra, Australia: Army Headquarters, Russell Offices, 2009), 5.

[49] Stephen Hess and Marvin Kalb, *The Media and the War on Terrorism* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2003), 63.

In the last two decades and in the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the power and influence of global connectivity are just beginning to be realized.

In 1992, President George H.W. Bush was quoted as saying that he received better information from CNN than he did from many of his diplomats.[50] President Bush saw continuous coverage and images of starving children in Somalia during a time in which he was under pressure to take some type of military action in the former Yugoslavia. His Secretary of State, Lawrence S. Eagleburger, attests to the fact that these images partially drove President Bush's decision to send troops to provide humanitarian assistance and restore security in Somalia. President Bush also contacted his successor, President-Elect Bill Clinton, to inform him of his decision and to petition his support. Ironically, less than a year later, it was images of a dead U.S. Soldier being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu after two U.S. Blackhawk helicopters were shot down that led President Clinton to withdraw American troops from Somalia. [51]

In a more recent example, images and reports of a U.S. Army Staff Sergeant shooting a Koran on a firing range during operations in Iraq in 2008 sent ripples through both domestic and international audiences, especially incensing Islamic audiences. The reaction by Islamic populations in Iraq and elsewhere over the isolated actions of one individual soldier subsequently led to an internationally publicized apology by President George W. Bush.[52]

These incidents only display the unintended consequences of naturally and accidentally occurring events. The use of global connectivity by enemies of the United States is another case all together. Insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan have become masters of influencing the opinions of their local populations, as well as international and American public opinion through global

---

[50] Hess and Kalb, *The Media,* 63.

[51] Hess and Kalb, *The Media,* 64.

[52] Associated Press, "Iraq TV: Bush Sorry for Koran Shooting," Military.com, http://www.military.com/news/article/iraq-tv-bush-sorry-for-quran-shooting.html?ESRC=eb.nl (accessed March 21, 2010).

media technology. Insurgents have learned to produce a constant flow of images and information over the internet and subsequently through major media outlets around the world to communicate their messages as well as to counter the limited messages being provided by American military forces conducting operations in their respective geographic areas. During the periods of greatest violence in Iraq, the insurgency produced more press releases than U.S. forces in all of the Middle-East.[53] Images of improvised explosive devices detonating against U.S. patrols, videos of kidnappings and beheadings, and a constant drum beat of ideological propaganda serve well to sway the opinions of audiences around the globe and sometimes drive U.S. policy and military decision making. Ideological groups have also leveraged the power of the internet as a recruiting tool to draw more people to their cause and to maintain communication and morale among existing members of their sects.

The importance of these issues will only increase as technology and global connectivity continue to grow with each passing day. In early 2010, the first ever applications for Internationalized Domain Names (IDN's) were submitted to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).[54] What this means for global connectivity is that internet domain names are no longer exclusively in Latin characters. The portion of the domain name after the "dot," as in ".com," can now be in other languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, and Russian. It is estimated that of the nearly 1.6 billion current users of the internet, half are born using languages that do not use Latin script.[55] These users will now be able to type domain names using their own languages, vastly increasing accessibility around the globe. While this is only one example of the complex nature of the global media environment, it is potentially a

---

[53] Rid and Hecker, *War 2.0,* 3.

[54] AFP, "Internet Inches Closer to Internationalization" Breitbart, http://www.breitbart.com/ article.php?id= CNG.13ac0d5c8683cde 272d6517 ecfd6d5a2.a51&show_article=1 (accessed March 4, 2101)

[55] AFP, "Internet Inches Closer."

game-changer for both the media and the military and demonstrates how global connectivity will continue to grow well beyond the control of the United States and especially the military.

Answering this issue requires action on several fronts. Recruiting, training, and maintaining linguists and computer/communications technicians should be a top priority for the military. This cannot be overemphasized. Language skills and computer/communications expertise among service members are insufficient to address the demands of these new technologies and the ever-increasing global nature of the information environment. Additionally, the Army's technological superiority must be maintained through constant life-cycling of computer software and interface peripherals capable of operating in multiple languages. Circumstances are similar for media professionals. Journalists who fail to comprehend the importance of technology in communicating information to their desired audiences will continue to lose ground around the globe.

These examples are just a few of many that demonstrate the impact of modern media communications technology and global connectivity on military operations and U.S. policy. Globalization requires military professionals to be proactive in analyzing the potential impact and reaction of various population groups to media stories, as well as to friendly and enemy messages released to the public and to be prepared to respond quickly and accurately when necessary.

The challenges posed by today's complex media environment are daunting, but are nothing that cannot be overcome through knowledge and understanding. Military and media professionals have their work cut out for them. The public's access to and demand for information is unlikely to subside in the near future. Such demand will also continue to drive down the cost of access to the infrastructure over which media information is transmitted. More and more citizens will likely participate in the news cycle as internet and mobile device usage continues to grow and mediums such as social networking and blogging become ever-more mainstream. These changes will take place not only in America's backyard, but on a global scale. Globalization will continue to tear down the barriers between "domestic" and "international"

audiences. The balance between openness and operations security requires constant adjustment on the part of both the media and the military as the media environment continues to evolve and grow.

Understanding Solutions and Common Ground

The military and the press are two institutions which, to a degree, are inherently opposed to each other. The military values an organized chain of command, loyalty, sacrifice and secrecy. The press, on the other hand, stresses individualism, the questioning of authority, skepticism, openness, and a perpetual search for "truth." These two different institutional outlooks create inevitable tensions between the military and the press. – Michael D. Steger[56]

Understanding why there needs to be a balance between openness and security in military/media relations accompanied by an understanding of the challenges of the modern media environment provides an excellent backdrop for understanding solutions and common ground upon which an effective balance can be built. This monograph established early on that the military and the media share the responsibility of protecting American freedoms, but considering the diverse values and requirements from which each side approaches this mission, asking for cooperation often results in an outcome akin to sibling rivalry. Anyone who has ever watched a military press conference or sat in on a military/media discussion panel can attest to the fact that cooperation between the two professions is a significant challenge. However, there is a lot of common ground to be found.

There are several recurrent themes prevalent throughout all of the research and interviews with military and media professionals conducted for this monograph. First, both tend to agree that operations security is unquestionably critical to military success, but that this should not be a blanket excuse for unnecessary silence and limitations on media access. Additionally, without fail, each and every individual interviewed for this monograph, as well as countless articles and books on the subject of military/media relations suggest that developing strong, personal relationships between military professionals and members of the media is critical to maintaining the free flow of information. Finally, it has often been suggested that military and media

---

[56] Michael D. Steger, "Slicing the Gordian Knot: A Proposal to Reform Military Regulation of Media Coverage of Combat Operations," *University of San Francisco Law Review,* Vol. 287, (Summer 1994): 957, quoted in Christopher Paul and Kim, *Reporters on the Battlefield*, 8.

professionals come up with a mutually agreed upon set of rules that both parties can abide by. The foundations for such rules may already lie within the doctrine and practices of both organizations. Each of these recommendations can play a critical role in improving the military/media relationship.

United States Army Special Forces soldiers are often referred to as "quiet professionals." To the general public, it may often seem that most members of the military are "quiet professionals" who are reticent to engaging the media and the public. However, remaining quiet when a situation obviously demands a timely and accurate response can appear very unprofessional. The military's silence in cases such as Abu Ghraib can be quite deafening to the media and the American public. Matthew Dowd, former campaign manager for the 2004 reelection of George W. Bush, suggests that military leaders, when given a choice, would prefer not to engage with the media. He suggests that such reticence results in countless missed opportunities to communicate proactively and effectively with the public.[57]

The military's dishonor-roll of media missteps is marked by several cases in which the reticence of some military professionals caused serious issues and cost the military significantly in public trust and legitimacy. Several of these cases have already been mentioned in this monograph – Pat Tillman, Jessica Lynch, and Abu Ghraib. In each of these cases, the old adage that the cover-up is always worse than the crime is applicable. The military often earns more scorn from the media and the public over its reaction to and handling of information pertaining to negative events than it does from the failures that led to the incident in question. Certain situations demand a timely and accurate response in today's complex media environment. Thom Shanker, Pentagon Correspondent for the *New York* Times, simply calls this idea, "maximum

---

[57] Matthew Dowd, served as the Chief Strategist on two winning reelection efforts - for Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2006 and for President George W. Bush in 2004, interviewed by author, November 3-4, 2009.

disclosure with minimum delay."[58] A partial answer now is better than a complete answer too late or not at all. Failure on the part of the military to respond in a timely manner leaves the information space open for filling and interpretation by other organizations and individuals who will not hesitate to provide information to the media and the public, true or not, with little regard to its effects on military operations.

This is a subject that has drawn the attention of leaders in the military and the media over the past several years. Most recently, Lieutenant General William B. Caldwell IV took up the mantle as the Commanding General of the Combined Arms Center (CAC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas from 2007 to 2009. He sought to foster a "culture of engagement" within the Army that would tear down communication barriers and build sustainable relationships with the American public while keeping them informed and connected with the Armed Forces.[59]   In a 2009 *Military Review* article entitled, "Fostering a Culture of Engagement," Lieutenant General Caldwell offered that the Army must communicate in ways that are proactive, innovative, adaptive, leadership driven, and sustainable.[60]

Lieutenant General Caldwell took action to move Army leaders towards this culture of engagement when he implemented a new graduation policy for the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) that requires every field-grade officer to complete a series of public and media engagements. The engagements include a media interview, submission of an article for publication, blogging, and a public outreach event such as a speech or live presentation.[61]

---

[58] Thom Shanker and Mark Hertling, "The Military-Media Relationship: A Dysfunctional Marriage," *Military Review* (September-October 2009), 6.

[59] William B. Caldwell IV, Shawn Stroud and Anton Menning, "Fostering a Culture of Engagement," *Military Review,* (September-October 2009), 10.

[60] Caldwell, Stroud and Menning, "Fostering a Culture," 13.

[61] U.S. Army Command and General Staff School, *Sharing Our Story with the Nation – Command and General Staff School Policy for Strategic Engagement*, Command and General Staff School Policy Memorandum Number 8 (Fort Leavenworth, KS, 2009).

While the engagements help field-grade officers communicate more effectively with the public and the media, the results of the engagements in terms of public opinion and support are difficult to judge. Furthermore, it is questionable that field-grade officers represent the appropriate age-group and military career level to begin such efforts. Such engagements and experiences may better serve more junior soldiers and officers early in their career development with Command and General Staff College providing more of a polishing and refining role in the area of public and media engagements. Lieutenant General Caldwell's efforts are, however, a tremendous step in the right direction that should be considered for implementation in education and training across the Department of Defense. It is critical that military professionals understand how to identify and present information that is not restricted by operations security requirements in a manner reflective of the professionalism and values upon which the force is built.

Military leaders must not only learn how to better engage the media, but they must also understand how to build and maintain trusting relationships with media professionals. Major General Mark Hertling, former commanding general of the First Armor Division, explains the importance of military/media relationships: "As a senior commander, I've learned how important it is to establish relationships, forge trust, and allow access (when appropriate and *earned!*) with those of the journalistic profession." However, he warns that "Unfortunately, all of us wearing the uniform have been 'burned' by a report or a reporter at one time or another and that certainly influences any relationship." Media professionals must also understand the tensions that hinder their own productive relationships with military professionals. Major General Hertling offers that, "a person is usually at a disadvantage when he or she disagrees with someone who buys ink by the barrel." [62]

---

[62] Tom Shanker and Mark Hertling, "The Military-Media Relationship: A Dysfunctional Marriage," *Military Review* (September-October 2009), 8 & 3 – This article is composed of the transcript of a discussion panel conducted between Thom Shanker, Pentagon Correspondent for the *New York* Times, and Major General Mark Hertling, who was the commanding general of the First Armor Division at the

Lieutenant General (Retired) William G. (Jerry) Boykin[63] is no stranger to the concept of a sour relationship with the media and how it destroys trust. In his book, *Never Surrender: A Soldier's Journey to the Crossroads of Faith and Freedom*, he explains that of all the military operations he participated in, few were more challenging than his battle with the media while serving as the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence under Donald Rumsfeld:

> But I had no idea of the national firestorm that lay ahead – that pundits would concoct outright lies – such as that I had said the terror war was a "continuation of the crusades," or that I had issued an instruction on how to torture the detainees at Guantanamo Bay – and that I would face criminal charges based on those lies. I had no idea that within days, Muslim extremists across the globe would begin issuing death threats against me and my family, and that George W. Bush, my commander-in-chief, would stand in the White House Rose Garden and, without even an investigation, publicly disavow me.[64]

Lieutenant General Boykin is a devout Christian who often shares how his faith has influenced his life and career with church congregations and Christian faith groups around the country. William Arkin of NBC News collected audio and video tapes of these presentations and selected key quotes that were presented out of context and released on a NBC News television broadcast. The *Los Angeles Times* quickly followed up with a print article quoting additional out of context statements.

The selected compilation of audio and video clips was presented in a manner to appear as if Lieutenant General Boykin was portraying the Global War on Terrorism as a religious war between Christians and Muslims.[65] A media firestorm ensued enraging some sectors of the American public as well as Muslim groups in the United States and around the world. The Army

---

time the panel was conducted. The panel was part of an after action review of the division's media engagement performance during their deployment to Iraq in 2006-2007.

[63]Lieutenant General (Retired) Boykin is the former commander of Special Operations Detachment "Delta," the U.S. Army Special Forces Command, and the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School. He served as the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence under Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld from June of 2003 until his retirement on 1 August 2007.

[64] William G. Boykin and Lynn Vincent. Never Surrender: A Soldier's Journey to the Crossroads of Faith and Freedom (New York: Faith Words, 2008),

[65] Richard T. Cooper, "General Casts War in Religious Terms," *Los Angeles Times* (October 16, 2003).

initiated an investigation that threatened criminal charges covering everything from the legality of Lieutenant General Boykin speaking in uniform at a church to the finances and paperwork involved in the trips he took to the locations where the speeches were made. He was eventually given a verbal reprimand for failing to clear the content of his speeches with security and public affairs personnel and for failing to state that the opinions he expressed were his alone and not those of the Pentagon, but was cleared of all criminal charges. [66]

Lieutenant General Boykin is highly decorated for combat in clandestine operations ranging from Operation EAGLE CLAW in Iran in 1980 to the Battle of the Black Sea in Mogadishu, Somalia in 1993. He was also severely wounded twice during combat. The fact that he says that his struggles with the media were one of the greatest challenges of his career speaks volumes of the tenuous relationship between many military and media professionals.

Reservations on the part of military members in dealing with the media are understandable. The frustrations of media professionals are also justified. Thom Shanker, a Pentagon correspondent for the *New York Times*, describes the media military relationship as a "dysfunctional marriage" in which the two parties only stay together for the kids. He explains that the "kids" are represented by the soldiers under military leadership and the readers who are citizens of the United States. [67] However one chooses to describe them, relationships between media and military professionals are difficult to build and maintain, but are mandatory for effectiveness on both sides of the balance in today's media environment. Military and media professionals agree that mutual trust is critical and that it must be the foundation for such relationships.

---

[66] Douglas Jehl, "Report Urged Action Against General for Speeches," *New York Times* (March 4, 2005).

[67] Shanker and Hertling, "The Military-Media Relationship," 2.

To put it bluntly, in regards to media/military relations, some journalists and military leaders can be trusted and others cannot. Sometimes professionals on either side seek to serve their own best interests damaging the trust of the American public, compromising the balance between openness and operations security, and disrupting the free flow of information. Thom Shanker explains that "Military officers have to build trust now, in any way possible across a variety of venues for interaction, so that when things go bad, as they always do, the reservoir of trust is there to explain and understand."[68] As for journalists, John Burns of the *New York Times* spent time as an "embed" with then–Major General David Petraeus when he was the commander of the 101st Airborne Division during the opening days of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM. Burns speaks of having the trust of General Petraeus and understanding what quotes and information the general intended to be released to the media. Burns was present for countless candid conversations with General Petraeus, sometimes of a personal nature, but he practiced ethical judgment in knowing when to keep things private and when to share with the public.[69]

John Burns is also aware that were it not for being well screened and trusted by General Petraeus, his presence, while not denied, may have been much less welcome. This leads to the contentious issue of profiling reporters who are to be embedded with combat forces for which the Pentagon came under fire in the media in August of 2009.[70] A reporter from the *Stars and Stripes* newspaper reported that the Pentagon contracted the Rendon Group at a price of $1.5 million to profile and rate reporters who would potentially be embedded with U.S. units in combat.[71] While paying a contractor to perform such duties is open for scrutiny, the practice

---

[68] Shanker and Hertling, "The Military-Media Relationship." 3.

[69] John Burns, London Bureau Chief for the *New York Times*, two-time Pulitzer Prize winner, interviewed by author, August 27, 2009.

[70] Leo Shane III, "Army Used Profiles to Reject Reporters," *Stars and Stripes,* http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=64449 (accessed February 22, 2010).

[71] Leo Shane III, "Army Used Profiles."

itself should come as no surprise to a journalist. The practice is probably far better served at echelons far below the Pentagon in combat units where leaders seek to build and foster healthy relationships with members of the media.

A good military leader or public affairs officer acting in the best interests of the military will take the time to research and learn as much as possible about a journalist prior to meeting with that journalist for interviews or as an embed in a combat unit. Military leadership should do this in much the same manner as a journalist researches a unit or a particular leader before interviewing or embedding. Military leaders should not use such information to infringe upon the free flow of information, but to understand who they can trust and how much they may be at liberty to discuss certain topics in the presence of certain reporters. Being informed about media counterparts also gives military leaders insight into political leanings and personal views of reporters so they might anticipate the potential tone of reporting from various journalists. Military leaders should maintain up to date profiles of an open-source nature (so as not to violate individual privacy) on any and every journalist that enters their area of operations. Brigadier General Edward Cardon, Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff School (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, KS offers that leaders should maintain a rolodex of trusted media counterparts to whom they can turn in situations that need media attention.[72] This is good advice for military and media professionals alike, as media professionals who have developed trusted relationships with military leaders should be able to call on them when news breaks for a timely and honest response. Trustworthy relationships can also be fostered by shared values and rules.

Many have suggested that there should be a set of mutually agreed upon rules and standards that apply to both military and media professionals to provide a healthy balance between operations security and openness during times of war. It is arguable that a framework

---

[72] Brigadier General Edward C. Cardon, Deputy Commander, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center (CAC), interviewed by author, October 16, 2009.

for this set of standards already exists, and it is a framework created by journalists and not

military professionals. The Society of Professional Journalists' (SPJ) "Code of Ethics" may serve

as part of this framework for a mutually agreed upon set of standards for balancing security and

openness. The preamble to the document provides some insight into this idea:

> Members of the Society of Professional Journalists believe that public enlightenment is
> the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to
> further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of
> events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve
> the public with a thoroughness and honesty. Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a
> journalist's credibility.   Members of the Society share a dedication to ethical behavior
> and adopt this code to declare the Society's principles and standards of practice.[73]

The primary tenets of this code are: 1) Seek the Truth and Report It, 2) Minimize Harm, 3) Act

Independently, and 4) Be Accountable.[74] While a complete review of this document will reveal

that it may very well provide mutually agreed upon standards for military/media relations, the

demands to "minimize harm" and to "be accountable" are especially critical and best lay the

foundation for agreement between the military and the media.

The SPJ Code of Ethics tenets to "minimize harm" and to "be accountable" have several

sub-sections that are highly applicable to military/media relations. The tenet to "minimize harm"

is underlined by the decree that, "Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects, and colleagues as

human beings deserving of respect."[75] Military and media professionals should always maintain

a mutual respect for one another's professions and for each other as human beings. John Burns,

former New York Times Baghdad Bureau Chief, tells the story of one of his paper's young,

upstart writers who did not receive the level of access that he thought was appropriate for himself

after arriving in the war zone, and threatened one of the General Officers that he was going to

---

[73] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics," http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp
(accessed March 22, 2010).

[74] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics."

[75] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics."

plaster his name all over the front page of the *Times*. Burns had to take the young writer aside and explain to him that there was nothing fruitful to this approach.[76] The young writer's respect for the General as a person and a professional was absolutely lacking and as a result, he was unable to establish a fruitful relationship with the General that may have yielded a higher level of information flow between the two.

The young writer's attitude was also contrary to another important sub-section of the SPJ code that states, "Recognize that gathering and reporting information may cause harm or discomfort. Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance."[77] Arrogance must be restrained on the part of media and military professionals alike. Arrogance breeds the kind of competition that leads to what John Burns refers to as "gotcha journalism."[78] Mr. Burns explains that arrogance on the part of former President Richard Nixon led to his downfall at the hands of two reporters from the Washington Times.[79] In much the same way, one of the most famous journalists of the past fifty years, Dan Rather, experienced his own downfall when he arrogantly stood behind a disparaging report regarding former President George W. Bush's military record during the run up to the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election. Even after the report was proven to be a forgery, Mr. Rather continued to lean on his own reputation, standing behind the story as he was quietly ushered into retirement.

On the SPJ Code's tenet to "be accountable," all military professionals learn and live by accountability from the earliest days of their careers. This is definitely a tenet that can be mutually agreed upon by military professionals and journalists. Among other mandates, this tenet

---

[76] Burns, interview.

[77] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics."

[78] Burns, interview.

[79] Burns, interview.

exhorts journalists to, "admit mistakes and correct them promptly."[80] Had this tenet been applied

by military leaders and journalists during the reporting of the previously mentioned stories of the

Tillman Tragedy, the *Newsweek* Koran in the toilet story, and the *Los Angeles Times* reporting on

ODA 2021, tragic setbacks in the relationship between the military and the media may have been

avoided. A final section of this tenet falls along similar lines; "abide by the same high standards

to which they hold others."[81] Military professionals conduct their operations based on the

establishment and enforcement of unyielding standards of professionalism, morality, and mission

accomplishment. Journalists who will abide by the tenets set forth in the SPJ's Code are no

different. This ideal can absolutely be mutually agreed upon by military and media professionals

alike.

The SPJ Code of Ethics is not the only place to look for such a framework. Such ethics

are also evident in the teachings of Journalism Schools across the United States. One such

example is found in the Missouri School of Journalism's "Journalists' Creed," written by the first

dean of the school, Walter Williams. One of the major points in the creed states, "I believe that

suppression of the news, for any consideration other than the welfare of society, is

indefensible."[82] Welfare of society is the critical issue here. Military members should expect

journalists to uphold this standard when reporting on combat operations by considering whether

the publication of sensitive information obtained by means considered legitimate or otherwise is

good for the welfare of society. This should include society as a whole and not just one political

or special interest group. If a story doesn't meet this requirement, it may be better left untold.

The creed also states, "I believe that clear thinking and clear statement, accuracy and fairness are

---

[80] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics."

[81] Society of Professional Journalists, "Code of Ethics."

[82] Walter Williams, "Journalist's Creed," Missouri School of Journalism, http://www.journalism.missouri.edu/about/creed.html (accessed March 22, 2010).

fundamental to good journalism."[83] Clear thinking, clear statement, accuracy and fairness are not only fundamental to good journalism, but also to the military's communications with the media and the public, exemplified by the cases presented in this monograph. For both the media and the military, reports and statements should be based on clear thought and not the emotion of the moment or self-serving interests.

These are just a few examples of how these tenets and practices could serve as important pieces of a mutually agreed upon code of ethics for military/media relations. Professional Journalists should be very comfortable with remaining within the boundaries of their own code of ethics, while military professionals share many of the same values of accountability, ethics, trustworthiness, accuracy, and fairness. While there's unlikely to be an all-inclusive manual for balancing openness and operations security that both the military and the media can agree upon, considering moderate steps towards better cooperation through ideas such those presented here can have tremendous effects across both professions.

Moving away from the tradition of the "quiet professional" may be a difficult task for military leaders, but doing so will reduce the likelihood of missed opportunities and prevent other entities from filling the information space. Modern military professionals cannot afford to seek sanctuary in silence when circumstances demand quick and accurate responses in the modern media environment.

Moving away from unnecessary silence and media restrictions is also a step in the right direction for fostering healthy and trusting relationships between military and media professionals. These relationships are critical for success to both institutions. Media professionals must limit the "gotcha journalism" that leaves military professionals feeling burned and unwilling to trust the media if such relationships are to grow and prosper. Trust must be

---

[83] Walter Williams, "Journalist's Creed."

earned on both sides of the balance. Neither party should be offended when the other side does a little research to make sure they know exactly who they are dealing with and who they can trust. Once those trustworthy relationships are built, they should be dependable in a time of crisis.

Finally, establishing a set of mutually agreeable rules can encourage lasting relationships by identifying values and standards that can be shared and trusted by both the military and the media. Values and standards have always been a foundation of military professionalism. It is apparent through the Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics that members of the journalistic profession also seek values and standards to live by. Journalists and media professionals alike can look to this document as a baseline for the identification of mutual values and standards that can be agreed upon to regulate military/media relations. Mutually agreed upon values and standards may prove to be an excellent catalyst for building and maintaining strong relationships between military and media professionals.

Conclusion

> After more than 130 years, the fundamental dispute between the American media and the American military has changed hardly at all. The essential argument is still about access. How much should the press be allowed to know and see of the conduct of battle?
> – Peter Andrews[84]

What is to be said of this elusive balance between openness and operations security? Maybe it is not as elusive as military and media professionals make it out to be. Perhaps it is hard to accomplish, and human nature often dictates that people choose the path of least resistance. But if the military is to continue to provide for the common defense of the United States and the media is to continue to keep the American public informed, neither can function without the other. This has been the case since the establishment of the United States Constitution and will be the case as long as America continues to exist as a free nation.

If the seesaw that is the free flow of information is to remain in motion, both the military and the media must watch their weight, making every effort to keep the balance equal. They must also keep an eye on the fulcrum that is the will of the American people, ensuring that no actions are taken to unduly influence that will and move the fulcrum too close to one end or the other. Putting all of these pieces together is a complicated ordeal, but by no means impossible if both the media and the military put forth honest efforts and emphasis from their ends of the seesaw. They must both understand the "diverse considerations" between military operations security requirements and media obligations to keep the public informed and then seek to reconcile them.

Understanding why the common defense of the United States is dependent on the military's ability to maintain security as well as the media's ability to keep the public informed is one critical piece of the puzzle. Each of their unique and equally important roles in American

---

[84] Peter Andrews, "The Media and the Military," *American Heritage,* Vol. 42, No. 4, July 1991, pp. 78–85, quoted in Paul and Kim, *Reporters on the Battlefield, 15*.

society are founded in the very roots of America's history. The Constitution of the United States establishes both freedom of the press and the common defense of the country. First Amendment rights of the free press are clear and concise, while the provisions for military security requirements necessary for the common defense of the nation are a bit more complex, but nevertheless unquestionably established by the Constitution and protected by all three branches of the United States Government. Tensions between the two are all but unavoidable, but those tensions are a healthy part of the checks and balances system upon which American democracy was founded. The tensions play a critical role in keeping the free flow of information uninterrupted.

With one eye on the past, military and media professionals must remain cognizant of the changes evident in the area of communications and information technology over the past few decades that create new challenges. Understanding how these challenges affect the military and the media, as well as the relationship between the two is an ongoing process. The public's unprecedented access to both information and the infrastructure over which it is transmitted will continue to increase and shape future operational environments. No organization has the power to monopolize the information space as in times past. Public participation in the news cycle grows as quickly as the mobility and speed of the technology that facilitates this participation. Public access to information and communications infrastructure has also nearly erased the boundaries between domestic and international audiences. Globalization looks unlikely to slow anytime in the near future. The fulcrum of American public opinion is more volatile than ever and requires constant attention from both ends of the seesaw.

Finally, examination of the roots of the free press and military operations security in light of the challenges posed by the modern media environment yields potential solutions to problems evident in military/media relations. Understanding some of these solutions and common ground is no small part of working towards reconciliation of the diverse considerations in the military/media relationship. "Quiet professionals" must come to grips with the fact that

remaining silent in certain circumstances in today's media environment is unacceptable. Failing to provide a timely and accurate response or restricting media access for reasons not supported by operations security requirements lends undue weight to the military's end of the balance. This can have a negative influence on public opinion and compromises the free flow of information necessary for democracy. It also jeopardizes the trust relationship between military and media professionals so necessary for both professions to meet their constitutional obligations to American society. Military and media professionals must grow and develop trusting relationships over time through which they learn to depend on one another in situations that require cooperation. These relationships are also stronger when they are built on mutually accepted values and rules. While the military has always been known for its adherence to core values and standards, the media must consider its own values and standards as a critical element of professionalism. Such values, as presented in the Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics, are a great baseline for development of a set of mutual rules to sustain a healthy military/media relationship and the critical balance of openness and operations security that lies therein.

An old proverb in scripture says, "A false balance is abomination to the Lord: but a just weight is His delight."[85] A false balance between openness and operational security is indeed detrimental to military/media relations. The responsibility for ensuring that the weight at either end of the seesaw remains just falls equally on the shoulders of military and media professionals. Only through efforts to understand each other's unique roles in American society can cooperation and trustworthy relationships flourish. This common understanding must be continually refreshed as the shifting sands of the modern media environment present new challenges for both the media and the military in their communications efforts.

---

[85] Proverbs 11:1 (King James Version).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, Matt. "Rethinking Smith-Mundt." *Small Wars Journal*. http://smallwarsjournal.com /blog /2008/07/rethinking-smithmundt/ (accessed September 14, 2009).

Aukofer, Frank and William P. Lawrence. *America's Team: The Odd Couple – A Report on the Relationship Between the Media and the Military.* Nashville, TN: Freedom Forum First Amendment Center at Vanderbilt University, 1995.

Australian Army Headquarters. *Adaptive Campaigning 2009 – Army's Future Land Operating Concept.* Canberra, Australia: Army Headquarters, Russell Offices, 2009)

Baggio, Daniel L. "Army Cultural Change and Effective Media Relations." Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2006.

Boykin, Jerry, and Lynn Vincent. *Never Surrender: A Soldier's Journey to the Crossroads of Faith and Freedom*. New York: Faith Words, 2008.

Coats, Sr., Eyler Robert. "Thomas Jefferson on Politics and Government." The University of Virginia. http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff1600.htm (accessed March 25, 2010).

Darley, Willam M. "War Policy, Public Support, and The Media." *Parameters* (Summer 2005): 121-134.

English, Edward L. "Towards a More Productive Military-Media Relationship." Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), 2005.

Evans, Sarah. "Bloggers and Citizen Journalists." Mashable, The Social Media Guide. http://mashable.com/2009/12/18/media-shield-law/ (accessed March 22, 2010).

Executive Order No. 13292. The National Archives. http://www.archives.gov/isoo/policy-documents/eo-12958-amendment.pdf (accessed February 10, 2010).

Felman, Mark D. "The Military/Media Clash and the New Principle of War: Media Spin." Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, 1993.

Hecker, Marc, and Thomas Rid. *War 2.0: Irregular Warfare in the Information Age.* Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, 2009.

Hess, Stephen, and Marvin M. Kalb. *The Media and the War on Terrorism.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2003.

Hudson, Miles, and John Stanier. *War and the Media: A Random Searchlight.* New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Johnson, Mark and Jessica Meyeraan. "Military Deception: Hiding the Real – Showing the Fake." Norfolk, VA: Joint Forces Staff College, Joint and Combined Warfighting School, 2003.

Kaspar, Beth M. *The End of Secrecy: Military Competitiveness in the Age of Transparency.* Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Center for Strategy and Technology, Air War College, Air University, 2001.

Kracke, Tina S. "Mass Media: The Ether Pervading the Clausewitzian Trinity." Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), 2004.

Larson, Eric V., and Bogdan Savych. *American Public Support for U.S. Military Operations from Mogadishu to Baghdad.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2005.

Lewis, Anthony. *Freedom for the Thought That We Hate: A Biography of the First Amendment.* New York, NY: Basic Books, Perseus Books Group, 2007.

Martemucci, Matteo G. "Regaining the High Ground: The Challenges of Perception Management in National Strategy and Military Operations." Norfolk, VA: Joint Forces Staff College, Joint Advanced Warfighting School, 2007.

Matthews, Lloyd J. *Newsmen & National Defense: Is Conflict Inevitable?* Washington, D.C.: Brassey's US, 6301, 1991.

MacNulty, Christine A.R. "Truth, Perception, and Consequences." Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Proteus Management Group, 2009.

McCuen, John J. "Hybrid Wars." *Military Review*, (March-April 2008): 107-113.

Nye, Edward T. "The Role of Public Affairs in Special Operations and Missions." Fort Leavenworth, KS: Command and General Staff College, 2002.

Paul, Christopher, and James J. *Kim. Reporters on the Battlefield: The Embedded Press System in Historical Context.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2004.

Payne, Kenneth. "The Media as an Instrument of War." *Parameters,* (Spring 2005): 81-93.

Ricks, Charles W. *The Military-News Media Relationship: Thinking Forward.* Carlisle Barracks, PA: Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1991.

Rossenau, William. *Waging the War of Ideas.* Arlington, VA: The Rand Corporation, 2005.

Saad, Lydia. "Americans' Confidence in Military Up, Banks Down." Gallup. http://www.gallup.com/poll/121214/Americans-Confidence-Military-Banks-Down.aspx (accessed September 14, 2009).

Shanker, Thom and Mark Hertling. "The Military-Media Relationship: A Dysfunctional Marriage." *Military Review* (September-October 2009): 2-9.

Shirky, Clay. *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations.* New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2008.

Society of Professional Journalists. "Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics." http://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf (accessed February 10, 2010).

Sweeney, Michael S. *The Military and the Press: An Uneasy Truce.* Evanston, IL: Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University Press, 2006.

Stockwell, David B. "Press Coverage in Somalia: A Case for Media Relations to be a Principle of Operations Other Than War." Master's thesis, Combined Staff College, 1995.

The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "Press Accuracy Hits Two-Decade Low - Public Evaluation of the News Media: 1985-2009." http://people-press.org/report/543/ (accessed September 14, 2009).

Thierer, Adam and Grant Eskelsen. *Media Metrics: The True State of the Modern Media Marketplace*. Washington, D.C.: The Progress & Freedom Foundation, 2008.

United States House of Representatives, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. *Misleading Information from the Battlefield: The Tillman and Lynch Episodes*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008.

U.S. Army Command and General Staff School. *Sharing Our Story with the Nation – Command and General Staff School Policy for Strategic Engagement.* Command and General Staff School Policy Memorandum Number 8. Fort Leavenworth, KS, 2009.

U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 360-1: *Public Affairs*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 530-1: *Operations Security*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2007.

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 3.0: *Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008.

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 3-13: *Information Operations: Doctrine, Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2003.

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 3-61.1: *Public Affairs*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2000.

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 46-1: *Public Affairs Operations*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1997.

U.S. Department of the Army. Center for Army Lessons Learned. "Media is the Battlefield." *CALL Newsletter*, No. 07-04 (October 2006).

U.S. Department of the Army. Center for Army Lessons Learned. "Media Relations." *CALL Newsletter*, No. 09-11 (December 2008).

U.S. Department of the Army. Center for Army Lessons Learned. "Public Affairs." *CALL Newsletter*, No. 08-27 (September 2008).

U.S. Department of Defense. Joint Publication 3-05.1: *Joint Special Operations Task Force Operations.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2007.

U.S. Department of Defense. Pamphlet 360-512: *Code of the U.S. Fighting Force*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1988.

U.S. Department of Defense. *Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication*. Washington, D.C.: Defense Science Board, 2004.

U.S. Joint Forces Command. *Commander's Handbook for Strategic Communication.* Norfolk, VA: Joint Warfighting Center, 2008.

U.S. Joint Forces Command. *Multi-National Force-Iraq (MNF-I) Strategic Communication Best Practices 2007-2008.* Suffolk, VA: Joint Center for Operational Analysis, 2009.

Williams, Walter. "Journalist's Creed." Missouri School of Journalism. http://www.journalism.missouri.edu/about/creed.html (accessed March 22, 2010).

van Baarda, Th.A. and D.E.M. Verweij. *The Moral Dimension of Asymmetrical Warfare.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2009.

van der Veer, Peter, and Shoma Munshi. *Media, War, and Terrorism: Responses from the Middle East and Asia.* London; New York: Routledge, 2004.